Evaluation Abstract

Title, author and date of the evaluation report:
Kibale and Semuliki Conservation and Development Project, End-of-Phase III/End-of-Project Evaluation, prepared by Florence Chege, Gershom Onyango and Sam Mwandha, July-August 2002

Name of project, programme or organizational unit
Kibale and Semuliki Conservation and Development Project (KSCDP), IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Office (EARO)

Objectives of the project, programme or mandate of the organizational unit:
To conserve the rich biological diversity and ecological processes of the Kibale and Semuliki National Parks and associated ecosystems for present and future generations. Key result areas:

1. Strengthening the management capacity of the two parks;
2. Strengthening the capacity of district authorities to address natural resources management;
3. Reducing the negative impacts of local communities on biodiversity values;
4. Adopting an effective and adaptive management.

IUCN area of specialisation: Protected Areas

Geographical area: Uganda

Project or programme duration, length of existence of organizational unit:
July 1998 – December 2002

Overall budget of the project, programme or organizational unit: Not specified

Donor(s): Government of Norway (Phases I-III, 1989-2002); Royal Netherlands Government (Phase II and III, 1993-2002)

Objectives of the evaluation:
To evaluate the overall impact of KSCDP and recommend strategies to sustain these impacts. To assess project progress and approaches to:

1. Determine the extent to which KSCDP progressed towards achieving its objectives and whether the results/outputs have contributed to the project goal;
2. Assess the sustainability of the project impacts;
3. Assess the capacity built within host organizations (parks and districts) and the community and recommend strategies on how to enhance or sustain this capacity; and
4. Identify, analyze and recommend options for sustainability of KSCDP-supported activities.

Type of evaluation: Final project evaluation

Period covered by the evaluation: Phase III and end-of-phase wrap-up

Commissioned by: Royal Netherlands Embassy in Kampala; Ministry of Water, Lands and Environment (MWLE), Uganda; IUCN – The World Conservation Union

Audience: Royal Netherlands Government, Ministry of Water, Lands and Environment (MWLE), Uganda; IUCN

Evaluation team: Mixed internal/external

Methodology used:
The evaluation was conducted through a series of interviews and field visits, gathering data from key institutions (including the Netherlands Embassy, the Ministry of Water, Lands and Environment (MWLE), Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), IUCN, Districts, the Kibale and and Semuliki Conservation and Development Project, community representatives, and "other" partners), as well as following a review of project documents (work plans, funding agreement, publications, etc.) and field observations. Preliminary findings were shared with key partners to seek further input, and all key institutional partners were briefed on the major findings, conclusions, lessons learnt and suggestions for ensuring the sustainability of the project's impact before the final report was written.

Questions of the evaluation:
1. The extent to which project supported activities contributed to achieving the overall project purpose
2. The extent to which project achieved:
   - Capacity and infrastructure for effective park management;
   - Capacity within the districts to plan for and manage natural resources and the environment.
   - Development of innovative approaches for sustainable natural resources conservation and management within and outside the parks.
   - Reducing negative impacts by the communities on biodiversity values in the target ecosystems.
   - Participation by the project beneficiaries in the planning and implementation of KSCDP supported activities
   - Integration of project supported activities within host organizations
3. The deployment of project resources (facilities, human power, budget) for project implementation and recommend the distribution of project equipment and property to beneficiary institutions.
4. The extent to which the project design and planning cycles and performance of key institutional partners contributed to the success of the project.
5. The application of an integrated conservation and development approach towards conservation and management of natural resources, and draw lessons learned.
6. The extent to which the phase-out strategy ensures logical close of the project.

Findings:
1. **Outcomes:**
   - Project had great influence in strengthening the management authority in the Kibale National Park. Not as much progress was made in the Semuliki National Park due to political insurgencies.
   - The project strengthened the capacity of district authorities, however, external factors that impede district capacity, such as inadequate staffing, transfers and voluntary movements of staff, inadequate equipment, and inadequate funding, which reduced expected project effectiveness.
   - Positive outcomes were achieved from pilot activities, including improved park-community relations; improved legal access to park natural resources and decision-making on the part of communities; increased community sense of ownership; reduced incidence of animal damage; increased community livelihood opportunities; improved agricultural productivity.

- Despite negative externalities beyond the project's control (high level of insecurity, restructuring of government administrative structures, inadequate capacity at the district level), the project's management strategies were maintained as a result of adapting previous evaluations' recommendations to the changing conditions.

2. **Long-Term Sustainability Gaps:**
   - Inadequate mechanisms for building synergy between the Parks' Long-Term Management Plans, the District planning cycles and the Environment Action Plans;
   - Inadequate human resource capacity at the district level;
   - Inadequate funding mechanisms for the environment in the district;
   - Poor marketing infrastructure for agricultural produce.

3. **Opportunities for Sustainability:**
   - Increased awareness on conservation and its implications to rural livelihoods;
   - Skills built in tree husbandry and agricultural activities;
   - Collaborative resource management agreements where communities report cases of illegal activities;
   - Harnessing institutional linkages and synergy.

Recommendations:

Long-Term:

(a) Capacity Building
- Address the inadequate technical and funding capacity at all levels of local government;
- Maintain and increase UWA funding for park management after project ends;

(b) Planning, Monitoring and Coordination
- Harmonize conservation initiatives undertaken by various government and NGO institutions in order to build synergies;
- Use the presence of the Makerere University Biological Field Station hosted at KNP to monitor park biodiversity trends and the impact of management interventions.
- Strengthen the planning and funding cycles between UWA and the districts so that UWA's role in the park-adjacent areas is reflected in the District Development Plans.
- Enforce the requirement for districts to have District Environment Committees.

Short-Term:
- Have Kabarole District appoint a DEO to coordinate environmental activities in the district;
- Appoint senior park staff at SNP to provide leadership;
- Review the modalities for the use of revolving funds provided to communities to ensure they benefit;
- Have IUCN document and disseminate lessons learned from the project.

Lessons Learned:

A series of lessons learned were highlighted in the report, including the following selected examples:

<u>Environmental Awareness:</u>

- It is more effective to use different types of awareness raising mechanisms as to reach as many different groups of people as possible, as well as because people respond differently to different methods of message delivery.
- Effective awareness campaigns require committed leadership at the district level and a budget allocation.

Sustainable Development Activities:

- Privately-run nurseries were found to be more productive and efficient in the long-term than those managed by groups. Group nurseries tend to be riddled by competition for benefits and poor management.
- There is a need to balance the ecological effects of a species with the needs of the community. For example, Eucalyptus is providing communities with quick income, but is believed to be drying out wetlands. Communities need information and guidance to be able to make correct choices.

Income Generating Activities:

- Income-generating activities proved more successful when carried out by small groups or individuals as opposed to large CBOs. Smaller groups are more easily managed and have less conflict of interest.

Population Threats:

- Initially, community volunteers were trained to distribute contraceptives. However, their enthusiasm waned after a while, and most of them stopped giving the service. Volunteerism does not last long where people need to invest most of their time in livelihood activities.
- It is necessary for the district and the Ministry of Health to plan and fund family planning (FP) activities at the sub-county levels where the services would be more accessible. There is also a need to target both sexes for FP so that couples agree on one line of action rather than be in conflict.
- The impact of family planning on population growth takes long to become noticeable. Besides, family planning activities require high capital investment as well as social and behavioural studies for which the project could not invest in.

Collaborative Management of Park Resources:

- Collaborative Resource Management (CRM) needs more time before it can be assessed for its impact on resource management and livelihoods. Lessons need to be drawn from the current initial experiences, and the monitoring and assessment of data gathered by communities strengthened.

Language of the evaluation: English

Available from: IUCN Global Monitoring and Evaluation Initiative and IUCN/EARO